

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

SAMAR AKINS,	)	4:14CV3150
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
	)	<b>AND ORDER</b>
KIMBERLY TAYLOR RILEY,	)	
LYNN QUENZER, and JOE	)	
KELLY,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis (Filing No. [12](#)). Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal (Filing No. [11](#)) on March 17, 2015. Plaintiff appeals from the court's Memorandum and Order dated March 2, 2015 (Filing No. [9](#)), in which the court dismissed this matter without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to prosecute it diligently and failed to comply with this court's orders.

As set forth in [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24\(a\)\(3\)](#):

(a) Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis . . .

(3) Prior Approval. A party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district-court action, or who was determined to be financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in a criminal case, may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization, unless:

(A) the district court--before or after the notice of appeal is filed--certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith or finds that the party is not otherwise entitled to proceed in forma pauperis and states in writing its reasons for the certification or finding . . . .

The court finds that because Plaintiff proceeded IFP in the district court, he may now proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis (Filing No. [12](#)) is granted.
2. The clerk of the court shall provide the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals with a copy of this order.

DATED this 18th day of March, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ John M. Gerrard*  
United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.